

29. (Twice amended) A system on a server computer system, comprising:
means for establishing a communications link with a client;
means for determining client privileges;
means for enabling the client to select a service from a set of available services,
the set of available services based on the client privileges;
means for providing to the client[, based on the client privileges, an applet which]
code that enables [I/O] communication with a [secured] selected service; and
means for retrieving a key from a set of keys, each key corresponding to a
respective service from the set of available services, the retrieved key for [establishing a
connection with] enabling communication between the client and the selected service.

30. (Twice amended) A computer-based storage medium storing a program for
causing a computer to perform the steps of:
establishing a communications link with a client;
determining client privileges;
enabling the client to select a service from a set of available services, the set of
available services based on the client privileges;
providing to the client[, based on the client privileges, an applet which]code that
enables [I/O] communication with a selected service; and
retrieving a key from a set of keys, each key corresponding to a respective service
from the set of available services, the retrieved key for [establishing a connection with]
enabling communication between the client and the selected service.

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 were examined and rejected in this case. Claims 1, 5-10, 12-15, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26 and 28-30 are being amended. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Section 101 Rejections

In paragraph 2, the Examiner rejected claims 1-29 under 35 USC § 101 as non-statutory. More particularly, the Examiner rejected the claims, asserting (1) that “data structures” that are not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material because they are not physical things or statutory processes, and (2) that the claims are directed to a collection of software routines and thus are programs *per se*. Applicant is amending the claims to place the elements on a computer system.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-29 are directed to statutory subject matter, and respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn.

Section 112 Rejections

In paragraph 3, the Examiner rejected claims 2-10 and 13 under 35 USC § 112 as improper hybrid claims for including process steps in a system claim. The Examiner cites MPEP 2173.05(p) and Ex Parte Lyell, which discuss the impropriety of combining an apparatus element and a method step in the same claim (e.g., “a claim directed to an automatic transmission workstand and the method steps of using it”). Applicant respectfully disagrees that the “wherein” clauses add method limitations to apparatus elements. However, per discussion with the Examiner on January 10, 2000, Applicant is hereby stating for the record that Applicant intends the “wherein” clauses to add further limitations into the apparatus claims from which they depend. Since each system claimed is part of a computer system, one skilled in the art knows that the additional structure includes program code, ASICs, PROMs, or other equivalent structure.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103

In paragraph 4, the Examiner rejected claims 1-30 as being unpatentable over Vogler in view of Brown (referred to by the Examiner as “Netscape version 2”).

Vogler describes a system that passes to the client an interface for submitting access requests. The system then takes the client’s internetworking address, and forwards

the address and request to the CAD tool server. The CAD tool server uses the internetworking address to respond to the client directly. Brown discusses SSL and public key certificates.

Neither Vogler nor Brown describes "a web server for enabling the client to select a service from a set of available services, the set of available services based on the client privileges," as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 15, 29 and 30. Further, neither Vogler nor Brown describes "a keysafe for storing keys, each key for enabling communication between the client and a respective service from the set of available services" as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 15, 29 and 30.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the above-identified reasons, independent claims 1, 15, 29 and 30 are allowable over Vogler in view of Brown. For at least the same reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent 2-14 and 16-28 are also allowable over Vogler in view of Brown. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under § 103(a) of claims 1-30 as unpatentable over Vogler in view of Brown be withdrawn.

If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (650) 843-3392.

If for any reason an insufficient fee has been paid, the Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the insufficiency to Deposit Account No. 05-0150.

Respectfully Submitted,
Riggins

Dated: February 28, 2000

Graham & James LLP
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043
650-856-6500



Marc A. Sockol
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,823